



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF  
MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

25 WEST 11TH STREET, NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

## Iteration Schemes for Solving Rectangular Games

HAROLD N. SHAPIRO

PREPARED UNDER  
CONTRACT NO. NONR-285(32)  
WITH THE OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH,  
UNITED STATES NAVY

REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART  
IS PERMITTED FOR ANY PURPOSE  
OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

IMM-244  
C.1



No. 1957121

IMM-NYU 244

December 1957

New York University  
Institute of Mathematical Sciences

ITERATION SCHEMES FOR SOLVING RECTANGULAR GAMES

Harold N. Shapiro

Prepared under the auspices of Contract  
Nonr-285(32) with the Office of Naval  
Research, United States Navy.

New York, 1957



# ITERATION SCHEMES FOR SOLVING RECTANGULAR GAMES

Harold N. Shapiro

1. Introduction. In connection with linear programming problems, or in the consideration of zero-sum two person games in normal form the problem arises of computing the value of and optimal strategies for a rectangular game given by an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A = (a_{ij})$ . Various iteration schemes have been proposed for achieving this and several have been proved to "converge" (i.e. accomplish the desired purpose). These schemes vary in the degree of their complexity, and with regard to what assertions can be made a priori concerning the "rate of convergence". For example, Von Neumann [1] has proposed an iteration scheme which though cumbersome for hand computations is easily coded for machine work, and for which he proves a very good a priori estimate of the rate of convergence. On the other hand, the scheme of George Brown and Julia Robinson [2] is easily carried out without a computing machine, and has also been proved to converge. In this note it is proposed to consider this latter scheme and by suitably modifying and elaborating upon the method of [2] provide for it an a priori estimate of the rate of convergence.

2. Description of the iteration scheme, and preliminary lemmas. The iteration scheme of George Brown and Julia Robinson is based upon the following procedure of fictitious play. Given the  $r \times s$  game matrix  $A = (a_{ij})$ , we start with two initial vectors  $U(0) = (U_1(0), \dots, U_r(0))$ , and  $V(0) = (V_1(0), \dots, V_s(0))$ .  $U_i(0)$  is player I's initial relative estimate of what he expects to win



should he play the  $j$ -th column. Player I then chooses the row  $i(0)$  which is such that  $U_{i(0)} = \max U(0)$ , ( $\max U(0)$  denotes the maximum component of  $U(0)$ ), and player II chooses the  $j(0)$  column wherein  $V_{j(0)} = \min V(0)$ . That is, player I picks the row from which he expects to get the most and player II picks the column which he expects will give player I the least. The two players then revise their estimates of the relative values of the rows and columns to:

$$V(1) = V(0) + R_{i(0)} \quad ,$$

$$U(1) = U(0) + C_{j(0)} \quad ,$$

(where  $R_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th row of  $A$  and  $C_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th column of  $A$ ). Then for the second play players I and II pick the  $i(1)$  row and  $j(1)$  column respectively, where  $U_{i(1)}(1) = \max U(1)$  and  $V_{j(1)}(1) = \min V(1)$ . As the play proceed in this way we have

$$(2.1) \quad U(n+1) = U(n) + C_{j(n)} \quad ,$$

$$(2.2) \quad V(n+1) = V(n) + R_{i(n)} \quad ,$$

where

$$V_{j(n)}(n) = \min V(n) \quad ,$$

and

$$U_{i(n)}(n) = \max U(n) \quad .$$

We then obtain that

$$(2.3) \quad U(n) = U(0) + \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k(n) C_k \quad ,$$





$$(2.4) \quad V(n) = V(0) + \sum_{k=1}^r \tau_k(n) R_k, \quad ,$$

where  $\tau_k(n)$  equals the number of solutions of  $j(\ell) = k$ ,  $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$ ; and  $\tau_k(n)$  equals the number of solutions of  $i(\ell) = k$ ,  $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$ . Clearly  $\sum_{k=1}^s \sigma_k(n) = n$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^r \tau_k(n) = n$ , so that dividing (2.3) and (2.4) by  $n$  we obtain

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{U(n)}{n} = \frac{U(0)}{n} + \sum_{k=1}^s \frac{\sigma_k(n)}{n} C_k, \quad ,$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{V(n)}{n} = \frac{V(0)}{n} + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\tau_k(n)}{n} R_k, \quad ,$$

where  $\sigma(n) = (\sigma_1(n)/n, \dots, \sigma_s(n)/n)$  and  $\tau(n) = (\tau_1(n)/n, \dots, \tau_r(n)/n)$  are strategy vectors.

We next prove several lemmas which are needed for later arguments.

Lemma 2.1. If  $v$  is the value of the game matrix  $A$  then

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\max U(n) - \min U(0)}{n} \geq v \geq \frac{\min V(n) - \max V(0)}{n}.$$

Proof: Letting  $y_k(n) = \sigma_k(n)/n$  we have from (2.5)

$$\frac{\max U(n)}{n} \geq \frac{\min U(0)}{n} + \max \left( \sum_{k=1}^s y_k(n) C_k \right), \quad ,$$

and since

$$\max \left( \sum_{k=1}^s y_k(n) C_k \right) = \max_i \left( \sum_{k=1}^s a_{ik} y_k(n) \right) \geq v, \quad ,$$

the left inequality in (2.7) follows. The right inequality may be deduced similarly from (2.6).



For convenience we introduce the following notations:

$$\Delta_{U,V}(n) = \max U(n) - \min V(n) \quad ,$$

$$\Delta_{V,U}(n) = \max V(n) - \min U(n) \quad ,$$

$$\Delta_{U,U}(n) = \max U(n) - \min U(n) \quad ,$$

$$\Delta_{V,V}(n) = \max V(n) - \min V(n) \quad ,$$

and note the trivial identity

$$(2.8) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n) + \Delta_{V,U}(n) = \Delta_{U,U}(n) + \Delta_{V,V}(n) \quad .$$

We next introduce the vectors

$$\hat{U}(n) = U(n) - (\max U(0))1_r \quad ,$$

$$\hat{V}(n) = V(n) - (\min V(0))1_s \quad ,$$

where  $1_r$  and  $1_s$  are vectors with all components 1, and of dimensions  $r$  and  $s$  respectively. We note also that

$$(2.9) \quad \max \hat{U}(0) = \min \hat{V}(0) = 0 \quad ,$$

and

$$(2.10) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n) - \Delta_{\hat{U},\hat{V}}(n) = \Delta_{U,V}(0) \quad .$$

Lemma 2.2. If  $\max U(0) = \min V(0) = 0$ , then  $\Delta_{V,U}(n) \geq 0$ .

Proof: Letting  $y_k(n) = \zeta_k(n)/n$ ,  $x_k(n) = \tau_k(n)/n$ , we have from (2.5), (2.6),

$$\frac{\min U(n)}{n} \leq \frac{\max U(0)}{n} + \min \left( \sum_{k=1}^s y_k(n) C_k \right) \leq v \quad ,$$

and

$$\frac{\max V(n)}{n} \geq \frac{\min V(0)}{n} + \max \left( \sum_{k=1}^r x_k(n) R_k \right) \geq v \quad ,$$



and the lemma follows.

From (2.8) we see that under the assumption of the above lemma we have

$$(2.11) \quad \Delta_{U,V}^{(n)} \leq \Delta_{U,U}^{(n)} + \Delta_{V,V}^{(n)} \quad ,$$

whereas from Lemma 2.1 we have (in all cases)

$$(2.12) \quad \Delta_{U,V}^{(n)} \geq -\Delta_{V,U}^{(0)} \quad .$$

Also, under the assumption of Lemma 2.2 we see that for

$$a = \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|,$$

$$(2.13) \quad \Delta_{U,V}^{(n)} \leq 2an \quad . \quad \checkmark$$

In carrying out the details of our estimate of the rate of convergence a simple numerical inequality will be needed, which we now provide as

Lemma 2.3. If  $m+n \geq 4$  and  $n \geq 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-2)}$ , then

$$\left[ 2^{r+s-3} - 2^{\frac{(r+s-3)^2}{r+s-2}} \right] n^{\frac{r+s-3}{r+s-2}} \geq 1 \quad .$$

Proof:

$$1 > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{16} \geq \frac{1}{2^{\frac{r+s-3}{r+s-2}}} + \frac{1}{2^{(r+s)(r+s-3)}}$$

so that



$$\begin{aligned}
1 &< \left(1 - 2^{-\frac{(r+s-3)}{r+s-2}}\right) 2^{(r+s)(r+s-3)} \\
&= \left(2^{(r+s-3)} - 2^{\frac{(r+s-3)^2}{r+s-2}}\right) 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-3)} \\
&\leq \left(2^{(r+s-3)} - 2^{\frac{(r+s-3)^2}{r+s-2}}\right) n^{\frac{r+s-3}{r+s-2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

3. Estimation of the rate of convergence. The estimation of the rate of convergence focuses on ascertaining how fast  $\Delta_{U,V}(n)/n$  goes to 0 as  $n$  goes to infinity. Since from (2.12) we have

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \geq -\Delta_{V,U}(0)/n,$$

we need only focus on obtaining an upper estimate for this ratio. For this we have

Theorem 3.1. If  $\max U(0) = \min V(0) = 0$  we have

$$(3.2) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \leq \frac{a 2^{\frac{r+s}{1}}}{n^{\frac{r+s-2}{1}}},$$

and in general

$$(3.3) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \leq \frac{a 2^{\frac{r+s}{1}}}{n^{\frac{r+s-2}{1}}} + \Delta_{U,V}(0)/n,$$

where  $a = \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$ .

Proof: From (2.9) and (2.10) we note that (3.2) implies (3.3) so that we need only derive (3.2). This will be achieved by induction on  $r+s$ .

For  $r+s = 2$ , the matrix  $A = (a)$  is  $1 \times 1$ , so that if  $U(0) = V(0) = 0$ ,  $U(n)/n = V(n)/n = a$ . Thus in this case





$\Delta_{U,V}(n)/n = 0$ , and (3.2) certainly true. We now assume that if  $\max U(0) = \min V(0) = 0$ , (3.2) holds for all matrices for which  $r+s < k$ ,  $k \geq 3$ ; and consider the case  $r+s = k$ .

Next we shall prove that given integers  $n$  and  $T$ ,  $0 < T < n$ , then either

$$(i) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n) \leq 4aT$$

or

*Q*

$$(ii) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n) - \Delta_{U,V}(n-T) < a2^{r+s-1} T^{1 - \frac{1}{r+s-3}}.$$

For suppose (i) were false; so that  $\Delta_{U,V}(n) > 4aT$ . Then, from (2.11) we obtain that either  $\Delta_{U,U}(n) > 2aT$  or  $\Delta_{V,V}(n) > 2aT$ . We will proceed on the assumption that  $\Delta_{U,U}(n) > 2aT$ , (an entirely analogous argument covers the other alternative), so that

$$(3.4) \quad \max U(n) - \min U(n) > 2aT.$$

Suppose that  $\max U(n)$  occurs in the  $i$ -th component and  $\min U(n)$  occurs in the  $j$ -th component. Then since a component cannot change by more than  $a$  in one step of the process, (3.4) implies

$$(3.5) \quad U_i(n-w) - U_j(n-w) > 0,$$

for all integers  $w$ ,  $0 \leq w \leq T$ . Thus we see that the  $j$ -th component never occurs as a maximum in the  $T$  steps preceding the  $n$ -th step. Let  $A^{(j)}$  be the matrix obtained from  $A$  by deleting the  $j$ -th row, and let  $U^{(j)}(m)$  be the vector obtained from  $U(m)$  by deleting the  $j$ -th component. If we then apply the iteration scheme to  $A^{(j)}$ , taking as initial vectors  $U^{(j)}(n-T)$  and  $V(n-T)$ ,



we clearly have that the first  $T+1$  vectors of the respective  $U^{(j)}$  and  $V$  series are

$$U^{(j)}(n-w) \quad , \quad w = T, T-1, \dots, 0 \quad ;$$

$$V(n-w) \quad , \quad w = T, T-1, \dots, 0 \quad .$$

Setting

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{U}^{(j)}(n-w) = U^{(j)}(n-w) - [\max U^{(j)}(n-T)] 1_{r-1} \quad , \\ \hat{V}(n-w) = V(n-w) - [\min V(n-T)] 1_s \quad , \end{cases}$$

we may apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain

$$(3.7) \quad \max \hat{U}^{(j)}(n) - \min \hat{V}(n) \leq a \, 2^{r+s-1} \, n^{1 - \frac{1}{r+s-3}} \quad .$$

From (3.6) and the manner in which  $j$  was chosen, it follows that the left side of (3.7) equals  $\Delta_{U,V}(n) - \Delta_{U,V}(n-T)$  so that we obtain (ii).

If  $n \leq 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-2)}$ , utilizing (2.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{U,V}(n) &\leq 2an \leq 2an^{\frac{1}{r+s-2}} \, n^{1 - \frac{1}{r+s-2}} \\ &\leq 2a \, 2^{r+s-1} \, n^{1 - \frac{1}{r+s-2}} = a 2^{r+s} \, n^{1 - \frac{1}{r+s-2}} \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Thus in this case  $\Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \leq \frac{a 2^{r+s}}{n^{1/r+s-2}}$ , and the induction is completed. We therefore need only consider the case wherein  $n > 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-2)}$ .

For a fixed positive integer  $T$ , we call  $n$  an integer of the first kind if (i) is satisfied, otherwise we call  $n$  an integer



of the second kind. In view of (2.13), if  $n \leq T$ , then  $n$  is of the first kind.

Let  $q = \lfloor n/T \rfloor$ . Then among the integers  $n, n-T, n-2T, \dots, n-qT$ , there are integers of the first kind (since  $n-qT$  is of the first kind). Let  $n-\tau T$  be the largest integer of this set which is of the first kind. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{U,V}(n) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} \left\{ \Delta_{U,V}(n-(i-1)T) - \Delta_{U,V}(n-iT) \right\} + \Delta_{U,V}(n-\tau T) \\ &\leq (a 2^{r+s-1} T^{1-\frac{1}{r+s-3}}) \tau + 4aT \\ &\leq na 2^{r+s-1} T^{-\frac{1}{r+s-3}} + 4aT, \quad (\text{since } \tau \leq n/T). \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all  $n \geq T > 0$  we have

$$(3.8) \quad \Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \leq a(2^{r+s-1} T^{-\frac{1}{r+s-3}} + 4T/n).$$

Consider first the case wherein  $r+s = 3$ . The result has been established for  $n \leq 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-2)} = 4$ . For  $n > 4$ , and  $T = 2$ , (3.8) becomes

$$\Delta_{U,V}(n)/n \leq 8a/n,$$

which is precisely (3.2) in this case.

We next consider  $r+s \geq 4$ . From Lemma 2.3 we obtain the existence of an integer  $T = T(n)$  such that

$$2^{\frac{(r+s-3)^2}{r+s-2}} n^{\frac{r+s-3}{r+s-2}} \leq T(n) \leq 2^{r+s-3} n^{\frac{r+s-3}{r+s-2}}.$$



Recalling that we are carrying the assumption  $n > 2^{(r+s-1)(r+s-2)}$ , it is easily verified that  $T(n)$  satisfies

$$(a) \quad T(n) \leq n \quad ,$$

$$(b) \quad 2^{r+s-1} T(n)^{-\frac{1}{r+s-3}} \leq 4T(n)/n \quad ,$$

and

$$(c) \quad 8T(n)/n \leq 2^{r+s} n^{-\frac{1}{r+s-2}} \quad .$$

Choosing  $T = T(n)$  in (3.8), by means of (a), (b), and (c) above, (3.2) follows, and the induction is completed.

In conclusion we note that Theorem 3.1 together with Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$\left| v - \frac{\max U(n)}{n} \right| < \frac{c}{n^{\frac{1}{r+s-2}}} ; \quad \left| v - \frac{\min V(n)}{n} \right| < \frac{c}{n^{\frac{1}{r+s-2}}} \quad .$$

4. The case of symmetric games. In the case of symmetric games, for which the game matrix is skew symmetric the above scheme is considerably simplified by the fact that we may take  $U(0) = -V(0)$  and need only write down one of the two sequences  $U(n)$ ,  $V(n)$ . Thus for example, we need only consider the recurrence

$$V(n+1) = V(n) + R_{i(n)} \quad ,$$

where

$$V_{i(n)}(n) = \min V(n) \quad .$$

The result of the previous section then asserts that  $\min V(n)/n$  tends to 0 like  $c/n^{1/2m-2}$ , for an  $m$  by  $m$  skew-symmetric matrix.





However, the method of proof given above provides a more rapid rate of convergence in this case — namely like  $c/n^{1/m-1}$ . This stems from the fact that in the argument which led to the alternative (ii) in Section 3, when we delete a row (or column) we may (because of the symmetry) delete the same column (or row) also.

Whether or not the estimates of rate of convergence obtained above are best possible for this iteration scheme is not known. In all probability they are not. In fact, there is some evidence that the convergence is faster if some of the rows or columns are inessential. This suggests the possibility that the above method could be elaborated upon so as to provide an estimate of the form (3.3) in which  $r$  and  $s$  would be the number of rows and columns respectively of the essential part of the game matrix.

### Bibliography

- [1] J. von Neumann, A numerical method to determine optimum strategy, Naval Res. Logistics Quart., 4, 1954, 109-115.
- [2] Julia Robinson, An iterative method of solving a game, Annals of Math., Vol. 54, 1951, 296-301.



# Distribution List

Armed Services Technical Information Agency Document Service Center Knott Building Dayton 2, Ohio (5)	Directory Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Information Officer (6)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office The John Crerar Library Building 86 East Randolph Street Chicago 1, Illinois (1)	Naval War College Logistics Department Luce Hall Newport, Rhode Island (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York (1)	Office of Technical Services Department of Commerce Washington 25, D. C. (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office Navy No. 100, c/o Fleet Post Office New York, New York (2)	Professor Kenneth J. Arrow Department of Economics Stanford University Stanford, California (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadean 1, California (1)	Dean L.M.K. Boelter Department of Engineering University of California Los Angeles 24, California (1)
Logistics Branch Room 2718, Code 436 Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C. (2)	Dr. A. Charnes School of Industrial Engineering and Management Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana (1)
Industrial College of the Armed Forces Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. L. L. Henkel (1)	Professor William W. Cooper Graduate School of Industrial Administration Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania (1)
Director National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C. (1)	Rear Admiral H.E. Eccles, USN, (RET) 101 Washington Street Newport, Rhode Island
Director National Security Agency Washington 25, D. C. (1)	Professor David Gale Department of Mathematics Brown University Providence, Rhode Island (1)
	Mr. Murray A. Geisler The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California (1)



Dr. J. Heller  
Navy Management Office  
Washington 25, D. C. (1)

Dr. C. C. Holt  
Graduate School of Industrial  
Engineering  
Carnegie Institute of Technology  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania (1)

Professor J. R. Jackson  
Management Sciences Research  
Project  
University of California  
Los Angeles 24, California (1)

Professor Samuel Karlin  
Department of Mathematics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California (1)

Professor S. B. Littauer  
Department of Industrial  
Engineering  
Columbia University  
409 Engineering Building  
New York 27, New York (1)

Dr. W. H. Marlow  
The George Washington University  
Logistics Research Project  
707 22nd Street  
Washington 7, D. C. (1)

Professor Jacob Marschak  
Cowles Commission  
Yale University  
New Haven, Connecticut (1)

Professor Oskar Morgenstern  
Economics Research Project  
Princeton University  
9-11 Lower Pyne Building  
92 A Nassau Street  
Princeton, New Jersey (1)

Professor R. R. O'Neill  
Department of Engineering  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California (1)

Professor H. N. Shapiro  
New York University  
Institute of Mathematical Sciences  
New York, New York (1)

Professor H. A. Simon  
Head, Department of Industrial  
Administration  
Carnegie Institute of Technology  
Schenley Park  
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania (1)

Professor R. M. Thrall  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan (1)

Professor L. M. Tichvinsky  
Department of Engineering  
University of California  
Berkeley 4, California (1)

Professor James Tobin  
Cowles Foundation for Research  
in Economics  
Box 2125, Yale Station  
New Haven, Connecticut (1)

Dr. C. B. Tompkins, Director  
Numerical Analysis Research  
University of California  
405 Hilgard Avenue  
Los Angeles 24, California (1)

Professor A. W. Tucker  
Department of Mathematics  
Fine Hall, Box 708  
Princeton University  
Princeton, New Jersey (1)

Professor Jacob Wolfowitz  
Department of Mathematics  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York (1)

Dr. Edward Barankin  
University of California  
Berkeley, California (1)

Dr. Richard Bellman  
The RAND Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, California (1)

Professor S. S. Cairns, Head  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois (1)



Dr. E. W. Cannon Applied Mathematics Division National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D. C. (1)	Superintendent U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California Attn: Library (1)
Dr. Randolph Church, Chairman Department of Mathematics and Mechanics U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California (1)	Electronic Computer Division (Code (280)) Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. (1)
Dr. George B. Dantzig The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California (1)	C. E. Lemke Mason House Department of Mathematics Rensselaer Polytechnical Institute Troy, New York
Dr. Walter Jacobs Hdqrs. USAF, DCS/Comptroller AFADA-3D, The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. (1)	Alan J. Hoffman General Electric Company Management Consultation Services 570 Lexington Avenue New York 22, New York
CAPT W. H. Keen Staff, Commander Fleet Air Wing Western Pacific c/o Fleet Post Office San Francisco, California (1)	
Professor Harold Kuhn Department of Mathematics Bryn Mawr College Bryn Mawr 6, Pennsylvania (1)	
Dr. Max A. Woodbury Department of Mathematics New York University University Heights New York 53, New York (1)	
Dr. Richard A. Miller 4071 West 7th Street Fort Worth 7, Texas (1)	
Director Operations Evaluating Group Office of Chief of Naval Operations (OP 03EG) Navy Department Washington 25, D. C. (1)	
Captain W. H. Keen Aircraft Design Division Bureau of Aeronautics Navy Department Washington 25, D. C. (1)	

SEP 29 '61

MAR 11 '68

JAN 27 1972

SEP 12 '66

SEP 28 1979

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PRIVATELY HELD AND A



NYU  
IMM-

244 Shapiro, Harold N.  
Iteration schemes for  
solving rectangular games.

NYU

IMM-  
244  
AUTHOR

Shapiro, Harold N.

Iteration schemes for

TITLE

solving rectangular games.

DATE DUE	PERSON'S NAME
MAR 29 '66	
MAR 11 '66	
JAN 27 1972	Wayne Heming

**N. Y. U. Institute of  
Mathematical Sciences**

25 Waverly Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

